



for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention  
A Center of the U. S. Department of Education

Second report pursuant to State of California Interagency Agreement for the

**California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC)**

And

**California State University**

From the

**University of California, San Diego (UCSD)  
School of Medicine  
Department of Psychiatry**

In collaboration with the

**Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention  
(Center)**

In support of the

**CALIFORNIA ALCOHOL ISSUES PARTNERSHIP  
(CAIP)**

May 2003

## **California Alcohol Issues Partnership (CAIP) Second Report**

Prepared by the U.S. Department of Education's  
Higher Education Center for  
Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention  
55 Chapel Street  
Newton, Massachusetts 02548-1060  
Phone: 800 676 1730  
E-mail: [higheredctr@edc.org](mailto:higheredctr@edc.org)  
[www.edc.org/hec](http://www.edc.org/hec)

Higher Education Center West  
University of California, San Diego  
School of Medicine  
565 Pearl Street  
La Jolla, California 92037-5051  
E-mail: [tcolthurst@ucsd.edu](mailto:tcolthurst@ucsd.edu)  
Phone: 858 551 2951  
[www.atc.ucsd.edu/hec/CAIP/index.htm](http://www.atc.ucsd.edu/hec/CAIP/index.htm)

Higher Education Center CAIP consulting team: Tom Colthurst, Laurie Davidson, Beth DeRicco, and Barbara Ryan

May 2003

Preparation of this second of two reports was funded under an Inter-Agency Agreement issued by the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control. Views expressed are not necessarily the official positions of the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control nor the California State University nor the U.S. Department of Education.

**Table of Contents**

The Center Recommends .....4

The Eight Pilot Campuses: Variations in Environment.....5

Law and Prevention Converge: A New Standard Emerges .....14

Expanding CAIP throughout California Higher Education.....15

New Financial Resources .....17

Appendices

1. Acknowledgments .....19

2. Eight Pilot Campus Data Tables .....20

3. CAIP Memorandum of Understanding.....21

4. Scope of Work .....22

5. HEC CAIP Chronology .....23

6. Pilot Campus Alcohol Policy and Enforcement Snapshots .....26

7. Santa Cruz Alcohol Permit Fee .....28

## **The Center Recommends that:**

1. The California State University (CSU) system and its California Alcohol Issues Partnership (CAIP) partners continue to acknowledge the diversity of CSU campus-communities, especially the eight pilot campuses. As CSU campuses vary on a host of characteristics associated with the extent of alcohol-related problems, system administration should continue to support individual campus-communities in the development of problem-oriented responses suited to their specific circumstances.
2. The CSU system, California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP), and county alcohol and drug program administrators consider adoption of a common set of problem indicator data as a threshold for periodic campus and community coalition and systemwide surveillance and self-assessment. Such data is available from campus and community law enforcement, health service, and other sources (e.g., campus residential services), in addition to survey findings of student behavior and attitudes.
3. The CSU system and its CAIP partners support a multi-year, multi-site, workplan of learning and technical assistance to expand CAIP to encompass all segments (public and private schools inclusive of community colleges) of California higher education, allowing adoption on a state wide basis of a new higher standard of practice regarding alcohol problems. (We outline such a workplan in this report.)
4. The CSU system and its CAIP partners encourage inclusion of county alcohol and drug program administrators within campus-community partnerships, especially in anticipation of ADP's forthcoming call to the counties for State Incentive Grant (SIG) grant applications.
5. Municipalities in which CSU and University of California (UC) campuses situated follow the lead of Oakland, Santa Cruz, and Santa Rosa by adoption of an Alcohol Permit Fee to support enhanced local enforcement of state alcohol beverage control (ABC) laws.
6. Municipalities in which CSU and UC campuses situated follow the lead of San Diego, Oceanside, and Poway, by adoption of House Party ordinances that hold adult hosts and home owners responsible for underage alcohol consumption within their premises.

## The Eight Pilot Campuses: Variations in Environment

### *Eight of 23 to demonstrate potential*

The CSU campus vice presidents for student affairs invited eight campuses to participate in a pilot program of enhanced prevention efforts involving district ABC personnel and local law enforcement – both municipal and campus police departments. San Diego's Collegiate-Community Alcohol Prevention Partnership (C-CAPP; see Web site at [www.c-capp.org/](http://www.c-capp.org/)) has several years of experience involving such law enforcement and ABC cooperation, resulting in reductions in high-risk alcohol service, underage sales, and disruptive parties in student neighborhoods.

The eight pilot campuses are:

**Chico.** Founded in 1887, this downtown campus prides itself on being one of CSU's most selective universities and claims the second highest graduation rate in the CSU system for freshmen. Chico, a leading city in Northstate, that part of California north of Sacramento, is also home to Butte Community College. Nearly half the city's population of 64,500 is under 25 years old. Undergraduates: 14,634 with growth plans to 15,000 in upcoming years. Median student age 21 and 46 percent male.

**Fresno.** Cal State Fresno is the premier public university serving the San Joaquin Valley, a diverse and growing region of the state. The suburban campus is proud of its intercollegiate athletic records that attract extensive community support. Undergraduates: 13,070. Median student age 22 and 44 percent male.

**Hayward.** CSU Hayward draws students from three counties to the east and south of San Francisco Bay, its hilltop location commanding panoramic views yet convenient to freeways leading in all directions. Internationally popular, the current student body reflects over 80 nations. Undergraduates: 9,703 with up to 7 percent annual growth forecast. Median student age 23 and 37 percent male.

**Long Beach.** A large metropolitan campus near Pacific Coast Highway, CSU Long Beach, nicknamed *The Beach*, offers each California high school valedictorian a full scholarship, drawing between 300 and 400 annually. Undergraduates: 27,863. Median student age 22 and 40 percent male.

**Monterey Bay.** One of the newest CSU campuses, Monterey Bay occupies the former Fort Ord Army base, having recycled military facilities into instructional, research, administrative, social/recreational, and living space. CSU Monterey Bay is bounded by the communities of Seaside (three miles to the south) and Marina (two miles to the north). Undergraduates: 3,162 with growth plans to 8,300 (2010). Sixty-four percent of undergraduates 21 years old or younger and 39 percent male.

**Sacramento.** Known as the Capital University, Cal State Sacramento takes advantage of its location by offering a Capitol fellowship program and housing the Center for California Studies. The campus lies in an eastern suburban neighborhood. Undergraduates: 16,050. Mean student age 22 and 41 percent male.

**San Bernardino.** Since its 1965 inception, CSU San Bernardino is one of the fastest growing in the CSU system. The campus has the 10th largest teacher preparation program in the country and features the only accredited MBA program in the Inland Empire. Between 3,000 and 4,000 students live in

nearby off-campus apartments that comprise – with recent commercial developments – a suburban university district. Undergraduates: 12,638 with growth plans to 18,000 (2010). Twenty-five percent of undergraduates 20 years of age or younger, median student age 23, and 36 percent male.

**Sonoma.** Sonoma State is the only California member of the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges. The campus' rural setting is bounded by the cities of Cotati and Rohnert Park, with immediate commercial development just getting underway. Undergraduates: 5,746 with growth anticipated to 10,000. Fifty-seven percent of undergraduates 21 years old or younger and 34 percent male.

### ***Diversity of CSU system and eight pilot campuses***

These campuses represent a diversity of environments and challenges, reflecting the entire CSU system, as noted in our January 2003 report and summarized for the eight pilot campuses in Appendix 2. This diversity can be measured in any number of ways, including the variance in proportion of undergraduates aged under 21 years (ranging from 25 percent to nearly half) and male students (from 34 to 46 percent). National studies associate alcohol problems with a younger student body and prevalence of males.

There is no single pattern of student residential locations among the CSU pilot campuses, a challenge when determining the extent of the "community" with which to partner for prevention. Three of the eight campuses have a preponderance (80 to 85 percent) of first-year students living on campus. The rates of total undergraduates living on campus vary from 59 percent at the high end to 2 percent at the low end.

Several of the campuses report that most off-campus students reside in a two to three mile radius, while at the other extreme, a metropolitan campus of nearly 10,000 undergraduates records students' residential location as fairly evenly distributed within a 50 mile, three-county radius. Only one of the campuses is immediately adjacent to a central business district with merchants, including bars that apparently – based on campus advertising – cater to the student trade.

Campuses reported that between 0 and 9 percent of undergraduates reside in Greek housing. At the high end, the 9 percent occupied 21 recognized chapter houses, all situated within a concentrated area two blocks off campus.

### ***Study Methodology***

The Higher Education Center earlier conducted a systemwide assessment of CSU campuses resulting in a summary report of findings, recommendations, and data tabulations submitted to the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC), California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP), the CSU Chancellor's Office, and the CSU alcohol steering committee. By agreement with the CSU Chancellor's Office, we did not widely circulate those first results, although with permission, we included select – but not attributed – data in a presentation to the Second CSU alcohol policy conference in April 2003.

Our second phase involved closer assessment of the eight pilot campuses selected to participate with ABC and local law enforcement in enhanced prevention efforts. One of the Center's associate directors

visited each of the eight campuses to gather further information about the CAIP survey and DFSCA biennial review report.

In these two phases, the Center gathered data from the campuses and surrounding communities from four principal sources. First, we tabulated CAIP surveys as described in our first (January 2003) report. Secondly, we analyzed Drug-free Schools and Campuses Act (DFSCA) biennial reports. Thirdly, we scanned the eight pilot campuses primarily by a brief visit to each campus and a walk or drive through surrounding residential and commercial areas, guided by the *College Alcohol Risk Assessment Guide* ([www.edc.org/hec/pubs/cara.html](http://www.edc.org/hec/pubs/cara.html)). Our scanning included campus and community media, bulletin boards, and campus venues such as food and beverage vendors and bookstores. Finally, we interviewed vice presidents for student affairs and, where possible, others, i.e., staff members, faculty, and representatives of state and local jurisdictions.

In keeping with our CSU pledge, we are avoiding specific campus identification in this second report, instead citing observations and instances of exemplary experiences without reference to any single site.

### ***Foundation for prevention: Data surveillance, strategic planning, and campus and community partnership***

Of primary and ongoing importance are specific problem identification based on systematic data analysis and strategic planning based on a logic model linking outcomes, explanative theories, and intermediate objectives.

**Data surveillance.** Several of the demonstration campuses can count on faculty interests to produce regular student self-report behavior and attitude surveys. Current plans at all eight campuses, stimulated by the California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) grants and potential for other extramural support, will undoubtedly lead to improvements in problem surveillance. In addition to student survey data, campuses tabulate findings from campus and community police departments and records from health and residential facilities. Two campuses stand out in this area:

- A faculty member at one campus publishes an annual *Our Campus Culture: Findings from the Campus Survey of Alcohol and Drug Use Social Norms* and conducts, each fall, a needs assessment and survey, similar to the college Youth Risk Behavior Survey.
- A faculty member, of long tenure, at another campus has maintained two decades of archival data about measures taken to reduce alcohol problems on campus and in concert with the surrounding local governments.

**Strategic planning.** Campuses vary in their experience with strategic planning for alcohol issues. One campus, with Federal grant experience, has adopted a plan featuring 13 measurable goals. Another campus has taken advantage of an ADP prevention services consultant, through EMT, to fashion a new strategic prevention plan. Other campuses are at different stages of problem identification and development of desired outcomes and intermediate objectives.

**Campus and community coalition.** The CSU system's alcohol policy specifies that each campus will develop a partnership with its surrounding community. The campuses have engaged in outreach to area health organizations, local law enforcement, and district ABC personnel. Some have been at these

partnerships longer than others. One campus has had in place a coalition forging an alliance with civic leadership that can serve as a model for others.

- City leadership (council member, city manager, police chief); other civic leadership (editor of daily newspaper, CEO of chamber of commerce, other business owners including hospitality ownership); educational leaderships (superintendent, local school district, and president, local community college), as well as campus leadership reflecting students, faculty, and administration.

### ***Environmental prevention strategies observed***

The Center has outlined five primary strategies for achieving environmental change, each designed to address a problem area that contributes to alcohol use in a typical campus environment ([www.edc.org/hec/pubs/prev-updates/em101.html](http://www.edc.org/hec/pubs/prev-updates/em101.html)). Given the uniqueness of every campus, it is important for each institution to analyze the factors at work in its community in order to determine which mix of these strategies should be pursued. Among other Center findings on the eight pilot campuses:

#### **1. Offer alcohol-free social, extracurricular, and public service options**

Our observer concluded that all eight campuses offered full programs of on-campus cultural, recreational, and other social activities bereft of alcohol consumption. We saw ample evidence in news media and on bulletin boards, of community options, too, ranging from ski trips to musical and theatrical events. Several campuses report expanding recreational facility hours or developing new facilities.

#### **2. Create a health-promoting normative environment**

As indicated in the section below regarding restrictions on promotion, the media permeating these eight campuses are mixed regarding the normative environment. To counter perceptions that underage and other high-risk drinking is condoned, campuses are employing a range of strategies, i.e., encouraging faculty to schedule classes on Friday, offering substance free housing, keeping libraries open longer, and supporting a wide range of social and recreational facilities and services that are alcohol free.

Several campuses are well along in social norms marketing campaigns. A social norms marketing campaign is aimed at correcting the misperceptions that students have about the level at which their peers drink alcohol. The hypothesis behind these campaigns is that giving students accurate information about campus norms related to alcohol use can reduce the amount of drinking by heavier drinkers (who represent a minority of students) while supporting the safer behaviors of moderate drinkers and nondrinkers (who represent the majority of students). Social norms marketing uses marketing strategies in an attempt to do just that.

One campus, assisted by a U.S. Department of Education grant, is already reporting a reduction in high risk drinking prevalence after the first year of program implementation. For that campus, social norms marketing is but one element within a comprehensive program of prevention strategies.



Another campus has built in first year survey-taking within its Welcome Week orientation schedule in order to record base-line data about drinking perceptions. As it gears up its social norms marketing campaign, the campus will compare subsequent rounds of survey data with the baseline.

3. Restrict the marketing and promotion of alcoholic beverages both on and off campus

What you can find in the bookstore? Bookstores sell more than books and stationery supplies and are typically a part of campus familiarization visits by high school students and parents. At the eight CSU pilot campuses, bookstores also sell clothing and other logo-merchandise, e.g., desk sets, key chains, decals, sports items, and coffee mugs branded with the university seal or a less formal icon and word mark denoting the campus. Six of the eight campuses sold beer mugs and shot glasses with the university logo or name; two did not, although sales staff at one of those two noted that such stock was on back order to arrive in upcoming weeks.

The campus press carries little in the way of alcohol advertising. One campus restricts the type of alcohol advertising permitted in the student newspaper. However, alternative media – including community newspapers freely distributed on campus – and, presumably, radio outlets inform campus audiences about where student consumers might be welcome.

Media both mirrors and influences expectations regarding a host of human behaviors, including alcohol consumption. Student produced campus newspapers vary from weeklies to dailies. Editorial and advertising coverage provide a range of information and norm reinforcement. Examples observed during one-day visits to each of the eight campuses:

- One campus weekly extolled the advantages of substance free campus housing. The student author praised the option as providing "a nice living area for...people. It is a place where they feel safe and don't feel pressured to do anything they don't want to do."
- An ABC agent's Friday night and Saturday morning on the job was the topic of an article in yet another campus paper, with reports on alcohol overdoses, fights, out-of-control parties, and citations for *minor in possession* laws portraying the unglamorous side of drinking.
- "What will you be doing over spring break?" was the question posed to seven students by The Roving Reporter for publication in mid-March. Three were going to Baja California; one planned on oral surgery; getting caught up on sleep and spring cleaning said another; family reunion and working were other responses.
  - "California alcohol tax awaits decision" covered a bill pending in the Legislature to fund trauma care through an increase in the tax on beer, wine, and spirits, quoting a UCLA economist.
  - Advertisement: "Absolutely Rosarito's best deal," promoting discounted hotel rooms, inclusive drinks, and waiver of cover charge at select venues, available at MexicoSpringBreak.com.

Student newspapers, of course, are not the only freely circulating periodicals on campus. Each of the campuses offered weekly tabloids, typically published on a Thursday, featuring entertainment sections and advertisements for alcoholic drink specials. Examples:

- Advertisement: "If you can read this, you've probably fallen off your barstool," proclaiming drink specials and featured entertainment, Monday through Saturday, and punctuated by cartoon figures heralding "Dude! Double vision for only five bucks."
- Advertisement: "Third annual fun run or walk: Shamrock Shuffle and flapjack feed," a St. Patrick's Day observation sponsored by the CSU campus, a nearby community college, and local law enforcement, taking place between 7:00 and 11:00 a.m. Campus officials described this as an alternative activity to pre-noon bar crawling that had become prevalent in prior years.

Handbills. Each of the campuses has a posting policy that requires pre-approval and authorization stamp before handbills or fliers can appear on bulletin boards or kiosks. The Center's representative observed a vigilant faculty member at one campus removing unauthorized handbills – advertising drink specials – from several campus bulletin boards. For the most part, these policies deter advertisements for licensed premises or private parties. Nonetheless, some materials do find their way to campus, either as unauthorized bulletin board postings or as stacks of cards left out in conspicuous locations. For example, at one campus, students could find stacks of glossy post-card-sized advertisements in a main-trafficked plaza area in which were situated booths for student organizations.

- A fraternity and sorority sponsored a themed event at a nearby nightclub, noting "18 to get in; 21 to drink" with admission at "Guys \$10.00; Ladies \$8.00."

#### 4. Limit alcohol availability

On-campus. Beer or beer and wine sales take place at six of the campuses in settings that also sell food, although with limited hours of operation corresponding to when students would likely be on campus. While five of the six include signage – including neon-lighted beer advertising – one of the outlets is barely noticeable within a larger food court operation. Campus officials report that these on campus pubs are not really a source of problems. Campus personnel stated that server training was a requirement for campus pub employees, a situation that has positive potential. It is conceivable that trained campus servers and managers could help raise standards within the off campus hospitality community.

Campuses also restrict alcohol in campus residences to those facilities reserved for students 21 years of age and older. One campus offers family housing, but still precludes kegs, even for of-age residents. Two campuses – sponsoring Division 1 intercollegiate athletics – have curtailed alcohol availability in sports stadia, as noted in our first report.

Off campus environments vary widely. At least two of the campuses are fairly distant from commercial districts with on-sale and off-sale licensees. Only one campus is immediately adjacent to downtown with a concentration of bars just steps away from the campus and student housing. One of the campuses has already participated in an ABC license application resulting in imposition of a 10:00 p.m. sales limit (as opposed to as late as 2:00 a.m.) for a new convenience store just opening across from campus.

Another campus has incorporated within its prevention planning the encouragement of cooperative agreements between retailers to establish minimum drink prices, eliminate special drink

promotions and happy hours targeted to college age drinker. Precedent exists for this approach in other communities with high concentration of on-sale alcohol licensees.

5. Increase enforcement of laws and policies

The Federal Drug-free Schools and Campuses Act mandates a biennial review so that campuses can assess their policies and procedures, including notification of students, faculty, and staff about the provisions of the law including enforcement of state and local laws. Each of the eight campuses conducted a review in 2002. One of our first report recommendations was that the CSU system consider standardizing the DFSCA biennial review reporting format, basing it on an outline of successful program components, e.g., from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA).

Campuses communicate policy expectations in a variety of ways, including Web sites, student handbooks, orientation sessions, residence hall agreements, and correspondence with parents of incoming students. At least one of the eight campuses sponsors a *Safe Rides* options to deter students from driving while impaired (or riding with such drivers).

A major focus of the OTS projects in which the eight pilot campuses are now embarked will be enhanced enforcement of ABC laws by campus and community police agencies in concert with district ABC personnel.

Several California municipalities – most recently San Diego, Oceanside and Poway – have enacted “House Party” ordinances that hold adult hosts and homeowners responsible for service of alcohol to underage consumers. As indicated below, other California jurisdictions have also funded local monitoring, education, and enforcement programs for licensees through municipal alcohol permit fees. The CAIP Web-site at [www.atc.ucsd.edu/hec/CAIP/index.htm](http://www.atc.ucsd.edu/hec/CAIP/index.htm) provides additional descriptions of both tools.

***Keys to Success -- Observed***

We also assessed the campuses, within the limited scope of our inquiry, on the basis of operational components, or hallmarks, of successful programs. In general, we found commitment to these *keys to success* and note that the CAIP MOU also underscores their importance.

1. Comprehensive efforts. The eight campuses, as demonstrated by their 2002 biennial DFSCA review reports and Internet presences (Appendix 6), exhibit differing histories and ranges of activities for engaging alcohol problem prevention. Because of the new CSU policy and the additional resources provided through state government, they are collectively embarked on developing comprehensive plans.

2. Strong presidential leadership. The catalyst for the CAIP MOU has been CSU chancellor Charles Reed. He commissioned the committee, including several campus presidents, that developed the new policy and led to the MOU with California government agencies. Today, a systemwide steering committee of vice presidents for student affairs provide oversight, coordination, and resource sharing. Incidence of campus leadership abounds, from support of an ABC license protest to restrict hours of alcohol sales at a new retail store just across from the

campus, to an annual letter to new students, parents, and guardians regarding alcohol, to creation of coalitions with civic leadership to address these issues.

3. Faculty involvement. Faculty members play a visible part at these eight CSU campuses in a number of ways. A faculty member chairs the campus committee at one campus. Faculty members conduct research on these issues. A faculty member serves as a special advisor to the president. Several campuses report cooperation from faculty senates in encouraging Friday morning classes and testing to deter a pattern of weekend high-risk alcohol consumption beginning on Thursday evenings.

4. Staff involvement. Student affairs, health services, residence life, and campus police are evident in their leadership at these campuses. Supported by executive leadership from the system and their respective campuses, many personnel share the commitment that alcohol problem prevention is a top priority. By sharing information and reinforcing the prevention mission, these staff members are confident in forecasting reductions in problem indicators.

5. Student involvement. Students were among those Chancellor Reed appointed to the November 2000 committee charged with reviewing CSU's alcohol policies and prevention programs. They serve now on campus committees and in a variety of other capacities, e.g., student government, journalists, peer advisors, and service-learning. While not always unanimously in support of efforts that might appear to curtail their behavior, students are making important contributions to the maintenance of safe, healthy, and learning-conducive environments.

6. Needs assessment and strategic planning. We addressed this important component on page 7 within the context of *Foundations for Prevention*. The prospective development and expansion of CAIP, important enough to warrant its own discussion that follows in a separate section of this report, rests upon the observed need for additional training and technical assistance to sustain ongoing needs assessment and strategic planning.

7. Resources. Likewise, we devote a separate section in this report to the subject of resources.

8. Evaluation. We addressed data surveillance and analysis on page 7 within the context of *Foundations for Prevention*.

9. Patience and persistence. As one long-tenured faculty member observed from his vantage of over two decades of research and campus and community service, these are long-standing concerns that call out for vigilance. Yet, he was able to chronicle steps that made a difference, e.g., changing the climate for an annual city festival, deterring visitors from hundreds of miles away from descending on the city for high-risk drinking on Halloween night, creating safe and healthy daytime activities as alternatives to the St. Patrick's Day dawn-to-dark bar scene, encouraging responsible hospitality within close-to-campus nightclubs, dissuading the campus bookstore from selling shot glasses and beer mugs, and maintaining an on-campus center dedicated to alcohol problem prevention since the 1980s.

## *Summary*

In sum, we continue to find – as we expressed in our January 2003 first report – that the CSU system consists of radically different types of campuses. Those differences, systemwide and among the eight pilot campuses, take many forms:

- Differing student mixes based on age, gender, residence, and extracurricular pursuits
- Varying contexts of alcohol availability on campus and in the community.
- A wide range of prevention readiness based on past experiences, data-sources, and community partners.

Nevertheless, all eight campuses, especially as they develop partnerships with surrounding communities, might benefit from grounding in evidence-based comprehensive approach, careful problem analysis and needs assessment, prioritizing of goals, skills building, strategic plan development, implementation, and evaluation, strategic use of the media, and an examination of how to enhance or create regional (city, county) partnerships.

In the next sections of this report, we address an emerging new standard of practice regarding alcohol problem prevention within higher education, one that resonates with the CAIP MOU tenets. We suggest a training and technical assistance program that would enhance and expand the scope of the CAIP, and we conclude by suggesting sources of additional support – governmental and nongovernmental – to make continuation and expansion feasible.

## Law and Prevention Converge: A New Standard Emerges

Legal precedents are changing in favor of identifying potential alcohol related problems within higher education settings and pursuing actions, based on best evidence, to mitigate those problems. Law professor Peter Lake, writing in *Prevention File* (18:2, 2003; [www.edc.org/hec/pubs/articles/prevfile0303.html#law](http://www.edc.org/hec/pubs/articles/prevfile0303.html#law)), posits six principles emanating from recent court cases to bolster the case for alcohol problem prevention within higher education:

“First, the fortunes of the **Greek community in litigation are tied to colleges**: A fraternity injury is a college student injury.

“Second, the duty of college is not to observe student life from a distance, but to use reasonable care to **prevent foreseeable danger** in the college community.

“Third, responsibility of colleges is not limited to the campus landscape, but **extends into student life and academics** (what I call a riskscape).

“Fourth, scientific evaluation is what reasonable businesses do. **Evaluation shows reasonable care**. For example, using the new NIAAA report’s recommendations (Call to Action, 2002, [www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov](http://www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov)) is a good way to defend a university’s approach to high-risk alcohol culture.

“Fifth, colleges **share responsibility** with students and other entities on and off campus, and should actively work with all individuals and groups who can facilitate campus safety.

“Sixth, high-risk alcohol culture must be approached **proactively to prevent injury**, instead of reactively to win legal cases at the cost of student safety. The casebooks are filled with instances where actors acted simply to avoid legal liability, but not reasonably in the face of danger.”

A new standard of practice is emerging, based on growing evidence of successful prevention strategies, the willingness of Federal agencies like NIAAA – in concert with higher education leadership – to embrace specific technologies, and the posture of courts in reinforcing a concept of shared responsibility to safeguard community well-being.

The CAIP memorandum of understanding (appendix 3) exhibits these principles: Work cooperatively; collect data; legislative agenda; coordinated regional and statewide approaches; review status, accomplishments, and goals. CAIP has the potential to demonstrate their value in California on a scale never before attempted as the UC system becomes a partner and one can anticipate the other segments of California higher education, the privates and the community colleges, also seeking participation.

## Expanding CAIP throughout California Higher Education

The eight pilot CSU campuses are benefiting from periodic exchange opportunities. Campus personnel participate in the annual CSU alcohol policy conference, next occurring on April 25. Over half the campuses took part in the U.S. Department of Education's 2002 National Meeting on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention in Higher Education in November and a like number are considering being in Austin, Texas, for the next National Meeting in October 2003. These are important venues for learning about campus and community coalition prevention successes from other parts of the country, but historically confined exclusively to campus-based staff and faculty.

As demonstrated through the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's A Matter of Degree (AMOD) program ([www.ama-assn.org/alcohol/amod](http://www.ama-assn.org/alcohol/amod)) and the Center's own work with local partnerships and statewide campus coalitions, systematic team building, strategic planning, and problem-oriented prevention planning are also valuable ingredients, especially when bringing both campus and community stakeholders to the table. Accordingly, we are committed to identifying resources for and developing, in concert with CAIP partners, a multi-year, multi-faceted program of training and consultation in California.

- First phase. We consider our work between November 2002 and May 2003, under contract with ABC, as a first phase. During this time, Center personnel communicated on multiple occasions with CSU systemwide and campus leadership and with state and local government officials to assess systemwide and campus characteristics, past prevention efforts, and upcoming plans. In two reports (January and May 2003), we conveyed analysis, findings, and recommendations to ABC, CSU, and ADP. We also developed a cooperative relationship with the Prevention Research Center, Berkeley, a relationship that will continue to deepen our understanding about alcohol problems in a manner that minimizes intrusion on campus personnel.
- Second phase. Prospectively, in a second phase (July 2003 – June 2004), the Center will organize a team-training event for the eight CSU demonstration campuses. Teams of campus and community personnel will examine factors in their respective environments and adopt action plans for implementation during the balance of the 2003 – 2004 academic year. Through a combination of resources (including the Federal Center contract and supplemental foundation grants and the ADP consultant pool managed by EMT), the Center will deploy technical assistance consultants to render guidance to the demonstration campuses. We will prepare a report that includes an appraisal and evaluation of activities, progress, and opportunities at the conclusion of the 2003 – 2004 academic year.
- Third phase. A third phase (July 2004 – June 2005) will permit a second round of strategic planning and action plan implementation with continuing or newly identified demonstration campuses, to be determined. Again, the Center will prepare a report of activities, accomplishments, and remaining challenges based on data furnished by CAIP partners. The report will also make recommendations about CAIP continuation and encompassment of other segments of California higher education, e.g., community colleges, and private campus and the communities in which they are situated.
- Fourth phase (July 2005 – June 2006). This final phase, under external funding, would enable an additional cohort of campus-communities to engage in team-building, strategic planning, and

## **California Alcohol Issues Partnership (CAIP) Second Report**

problem-oriented prevention with training and consultation from the Center and CAIP partners. A parallel track will be to identify and secure approvals for a resource plan to make institutionalization possible.



## New Financial Resources

The initiation of the CAIP, as reflected in the memorandum of understanding that now links six state government agencies and both the CSU and UC systems, has generated additional resources for both public education systems. California agencies have channeled funds from Federal sources concerned with the prevention of underage drinking and impaired driving. In addition, each system and its constituent campuses are devoting institutional resources. Meanwhile, pilot CSU campuses have also taken advantage of periodic grant opportunities through the U.S. Department of Education's Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program and ongoing consultation services provided by EMT under contract to ADP.

Other prevention resources may be available:

1. State Incentive Grants (SIGs). ADP has attracted \$12 million from the Federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. ADP will subvene at least 85 percent of this amount to county government alcohol and drug program agencies through a competitive process, this summer. County applications should address 18 – 25 year olds with emphasis on evidence-based strategies and partnerships with other community stakeholders. The overall goal is prevention of underage drinking and high-risk (aka *binge*) drinking.

Up to 20 counties will receive SIG awards by September 2003, according to ADP, with award amounts between \$100,000 and \$250,000 per year subject to renewal. Counties may propose countywide, subcounty, or multicounty partnership projects. Partnerships have an advantage in leveraging resources from multiple sources, so that CSU campuses, especially the pilot campuses, would seemingly be considered strong contenders for participation in such partnerships, due to already committed state and institutional funds. County partnerships including both secondary and postsecondary stakeholders would appear to be strongly competitive for SIG consideration.

While the county or its partnership subrecipient would undoubtedly steward any funds awarded, these new resources could be of direct benefit to the campus and community coalition, e.g., by strengthening existing community prevention coalitions, subsidizing responsible beverage sales and service training and enforcement, and stimulating additional after hours social, recreational, and transportation options.

Strong relationships between campus and surrounding communities, including county alcohol and drug program administrators, are apparent at several of the eight pilot campuses.

2. Alcohol Permit Fees. Enforcement of existing state alcoholic beverage control regulations, in addition to management policies and staff training, can reduce risks associated with the sale and service of alcoholic beverages, especially underage drinking and over service. At least three California local jurisdictions, e.g., Oakland, Santa Cruz and Santa Rosa, have adopted alcohol permit fees to fund enhanced local enforcement of state ABC laws. California cities and counties share jurisdiction with the state ABC in enforcement of such laws. A dramatic decline in the number of state ABC investigative agents proportionate to the number of active licensees, over the last two decades, underscores the need for local jurisdictions to make liquor law enforcement a

greater priority, especially in communities – like college communities – likely to attract 18 – 25 year olds living independently from parents.

ABC has made grants to local police and sheriff agencies to promote local enforcement. Indeed, Santa Rosa's adoption of an Alcohol Permit Fee program came about upon the conclusion of such a state grant to that city's police department. Santa Cruz' description of its fee-based enforcement program appears as Appendix 6.

3. Private philanthropy. The joining of six state agencies, the CSU, and now the UC system under the CAIP umbrella is an historic occasion in California. The two higher education systems – representing a combined undergraduate student body of nearly 500,000 – have both publicly committed institutional capital toward safe, healthy, and learning-conducive environments for their students and their surrounding communities. While government funding has been welcome to augment institutional resources, much remains to be done.

The Center has enjoyed supplemental funding, at a national level, from a major health-oriented foundation. Both public university systems have likewise been recipients of significant largess from California-based foundations.

Owing to the potential now at hand – and the possible expansion of CAIP to embrace private institutions and the community college system – we propose to explore the availability of private philanthropy to further the objectives stated in the CAIP MOU.

## Appendix 1: Acknowledgments

As in the run up to the Center's first report submitted in January, we sought and received welcome advice from leadership from the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (legislative officer Dennis Clear), the CSU Chancellor's Office (assistant vice chancellor Allison Jones and his colleague, Laura McCrary), the CSU alcohol steering committee (Shirley Uplinger, chair and vice president for student affairs, Cal State Sacramento), and the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (prevention services manager Paul Brower).

The following CSU personnel and community leaders were generous in their time and insights during Center staff visits to the eight pilot campuses.

CSU CAMPUS	MEETING PARTICIPANTS
Chico	Paul Moore, vice president for student affairs; Herman Ellis, Student Activities Office; Rebecca Berner, Shauna Quinn, and Melissa Stearns, Campus Alcohol and Drug Education Center; Walt Schafer, professor of sociology, special assistant for alcohol issues to CSU Chico president Manuel Esteban, and principal investigator, social norms projects; Roland Lamarine, professor of community and health services and chair of the campus alcohol and drug committee
Fresno	Paul Oliaro, vice president for student affairs
Hayward	Cathleen Coulman, director, Student Health Services; Maggie Gaddis, health educator
Long Beach	Doug Robinson, vice president for student affairs; Renee Twigg, director, University Student Health Services; Yolanda Cordero and Wayne Sugita, Los Angeles County Department of Health Services Alcohol and Drug Program Administration; Rick Henry, manager, Long Beach - Lakewood district, Cal ABC
Monterey Bay	Karen Mendonca, vice president for student affairs; Andy Klingelhofer, director of residential life
Sacramento	Shirley Uplinger, chair, CSU alcohol steering committee, and vice president for student affairs; Heather Dunn Carlton, assistant director, student activities/chair, Alcohol Advisory Council
San Bernardino	Frank Rincón, vice president for student affairs; Helga Kray, assistant vice president, student affairs
Sonoma	Rand Link, vice president for student affairs; Tammy Cotter, prevention specialist; Sharon Dzik, director of campus life and judicial affairs; and Heather Howard, coordinator of peer education and leadership; Barbara Graves, director of planning and prevention, Sonoma County Department of Health Services

## Appendix 2. Eight Pilot Campus Data Tables

**Table 1: Where students live**

Campus	FTE u/grad	% live campus	Number Live Campus	Number first year students	% 1st year live campus	Number 1st yr live campus	% commute	Number commute
Chico	14,634	10%	1,463	3,257	80%	2,606	20%	2,927
Fresno	13,070	5%	654	3,606	20%	721	95%	12,417
Hayward	9,703	2%	194	1,373	39%	535	98%	9,509
Long Beach	27,863	6%	1,588	5,725	23%	1,294	94%	26,275
Monterey	3,162	59%	1,866	963	85%	819	41%	1,296
Sacramento	16,050	3%	482	4,065	n/a	n/a	95%	15,248
S Bernardino	12,638	6%	771	2,292	27%	619	94%	11,867
Sonoma	5,746	24%	1,379	1,867	85%	1,587	40%	2,298
<b>TOT</b>	<b>102,866</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8,396</b>	<b>23,148</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>8,180</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>81,836</b>

**Table 2: Select extracurricular activities**

Campus	% intercol athletes	Number intercol athletes	% Greek	Number Greek	% Greek hsg	Number Greek hsg
Chico	2%	337	9%	1,317	2%	293
Fresno	4%	523	6%	784	2%	196
Hayward	2%	194	2%	194	<1%	<97
Long Beach	1%	390	3%	836	<1%	<297
Monterey	5%	158	0%	-	0%	-
Sacramento	2%	241	6%	963	0%	16
S Bernardino	1%	152	3%	316	0%	-
Sonoma	3%	172	5%	287	0%	-
<b>TOT</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2,166</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4,697</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	<b>&lt;899</b>

Table 1 and 2 sources: CAIP surveys from respective campuses except [www.calstate.edu/AS/stat\\_reports/2002-2003/F0206.htm](http://www.calstate.edu/AS/stat_reports/2002-2003/F0206.htm) (full time freshmen)

**Table 3: CSU Enrollment by Campus With Percent by Ethnic Group, Fall 2002 Profile**

Campus	African American	American Indian	Asian American	Filipino	Mexican American	Other Latino	Pacific Islander	White	Total Identified	Unknown	Non-Resident Alien	Campus Total %
Chico	2.2	1.6	4.4	0.7	8.8	.9	0.4	8.9	82.5	14.1	3.4	100
Fresno	5.9	1.2	9.8	1.6	27.0	.1	0.5	0.0	73.5	16.2	10.3	100
Hayward	14.3	1.0	23.9	8.9	9.0	.2	1.3	6.3	69.1	21.0	9.9	100
Long Beach	7.1	0.7	18.0	6.1	18.8	.4	0.6	1.3	83.0	11.6	5.5	100
Monterey	4.9	1.2	4.2	1.9	26.7	.8	0.7	5.5	81.9	17.0	1.1	100
Sacramento	7.0	1.2	14.9	4.9	11.8	.7	0.9	5.6	83.0	14.4	2.7	100
San Bernardino	12.4	1.2	4.5	2.4	25.3	.3	0.3	6.5	84.1	12.0	3.9	100
Sonoma	2.4	1.2	3.4	1.6	7.6	.2	0.6	8.9	80.8	17.6	1.6	100
<b>Systemwide</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>81.3</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: [www.calstate.edu/AS/stat\\_reports/2002-2003/FETH01.htm](http://www.calstate.edu/AS/stat_reports/2002-2003/FETH01.htm)

### **Appendix 3. CAIP Memorandum of Understanding**

(Paste in file from <http://www.atc.ucsd.edu/hec/CAIP/CSU-CAIP-MOU.htm> here)

## Appendix 4: Scope of Work

The California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control issued an Inter-Agency Agreement to UCSD on behalf of the Center. The Agreement's scope of work, following, is the basis for the Center's involvement, including submission of this report.

The purpose of this effort is to reduce premature death, injury, social disruption, and damage to property because of alcohol consumption on or around college and university campuses by promoting safe, healthy, and learning-conducive environments. University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention (Center) share the commitment of the California State University (CSU) system and the State of California, as expressed in the February 13, 2002, Memorandum of Understanding between CSU and six state agencies.

The Center will conduct an initial readiness assessment phase involve all the 23 CSU campuses – with more detail for the eight campuses designated by the System for initial emphasis. This assessment will draw from each campus' Federal Drug-free Schools and Campuses Act (DFSCA) biennial review and other existing data sources made available by the respective campuses and CSU Office of the Chancellor. Concurrently, UCSD/Center project personnel will assemble and canvass archival data – regarding the scope and nature of alcohol problems on and around CSU campuses – including documents developed during the Chancellor's 2000 – 2001 systemwide alcohol policy committee in order to create a summary memorandum in the fourth month about the extent of problems and solutions underway or contemplated.

UCSD and Center will perform the following task:

1. Conduct readiness assessment of 23 CSU campuses by end of December and furnish interim report to ABC. (Note: Report delivered in January 2003)
2. Develop a more detailed assessment for the eight designated demonstration campuses by mid-February. (Note: Report delivered in May 2003)

## Appendix 5: HEC CAIP Chronology

The Higher Education Center is now involved with multicampus and multipartner prevention coalitions in 46 states. As a way of documenting our participation for purposes of information-sharing and transferability of experiences, we are recording a chronology of key steps, such as the one below.

When	Who	What
<b>2002</b>		
February 13	CSU chancellor, California Cabinet secretary Maria Contreras-Sweet, and six state agencies	Executed CAIP MOU
April 12	CSU system	Convened first alcohol policy conference
June 20 - 23	Higher Ed Center	Convened fourth statewide initiatives leadership institute, with Cal ABC representative participation
July 10	Cal ABC	Approached Center about CAIP involvement
August 9	UCSD on behalf of Center	Submitted Inter-Agency Agreement proposal to ABC
August 22	CSU Alcohol Policy Committee	Selected eight demonstration campuses for enhanced prevention activities: Chico, Fresno, Hayward, Long Beach, Monterey Bay, Sacramento, San Bernardino, and Sonoma
August 29	Cal Governor Gray Davis	Established Interagency Coordinating Council for the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drugs with both the CSU and the UC as members and Kathryn Jett as the chair
October 1	Cal ABC and UCSD (on behalf of Center)	Reached agreement on terms and conditions of Inter-Agency Agreement
November 4, 2002	Cal ABC, CSU Alcohol Policy Steering Committee (represented by Heather Dunn Carlton, CSUS), and Center	Convened a brainstorming meeting of campus representatives, researchers, and public health and safety officials in San Diego for CPS/NPN meetings. The purpose of this event is to foster relationships, strengthen common purpose, and explore further opportunities for collaboration
November 18	Dennis Clear, Cal ABC, and Center's Tom Colthurst	Met with Shirley Uplinger and Heather Dunn Carleton, CSUS, and (by phone) Allison Jones, Chancellor's office, to coordinate schedules. Same day, scan CSUS and CSU Fresno campuses, and later met with Paul Olario, CSU Fresno

## California Alcohol Issues Partnership (CAIP) Second Report

<b>When</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>What</b>
November 22	Renee Twigg, CSULB and Network regional coordinator	Convened California roundtable at U.S. Department of Education meeting, with bulk of agenda devoted to CAIP.
November 26	Michael Cunningham and Paul Brower, ADP, Center's Tom Colthurst	Met regarding SIG and EMT resource availability for CAIP
December 2	Center staff	Launched Web site at <a href="http://www.atc.ucsd.edu/hec/CAIP/index.htm">www.atc.ucsd.edu/hec/CAIP/index.htm</a> and electronic mailing list to facilitate project communication and document access
December 5	Center's Barbara Ryan	Met with CSU Alcohol Steering Committee and with campus vice presidents for student affairs to explain Center's assessment role; Center agreed to restrict dissemination of campus-specific data; CSU concurs in limited release to state agencies and other researchers committed to CAIP mission
December 6	Center staff	Began to receive, tabulate, and analyze DFSCA biennial review reports and CAIP surveys from CSU campuses
<b>2003</b>		
January 22	Center staff	Completed receipt of DFSCA reports and CAIP surveys to be incorporated in this first assessment report
January 22	Center staff	Reviewed data tabulations and prepare findings and recommendations for this report
January 24	Center staff	Initiated phase two – focused on eight demonstration campuses – by initiating appointments with remaining six vice presidents for student affairs in late February and March
January 27	Center staff	Submitted first report to Dennis Clear, Cal ABC; Allison Jones and Colleen Bentley-Adler, CSU Chancellor's Office; Shirley Uplinger, CSU Alcohol Policy Steering Committee and CSUS
February	Center staff	Sought and received briefing and background document from ADP regarding SIG grant; began referral of qualified consultants to ADP prevention services, contractor, EMT, for possible training and technical assistance deployment in higher education settings
February 20	Center staff	Conducted site visit at Monterey Bay



## California Alcohol Issues Partnership (CAIP) Second Report

<b>When</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>What</b>
February 25	Center staff	Conducted site visit at Sonoma, leading to discovery of Alcohol Sales Permit option and additional research on feasibility for adoption by local jurisdictions in which colleges and universities situated
February 26	Center staff	Conducted site visit at Hayward
March 4 - 5	Center staff	Conducted site visit at Chico
March 13	University of California president Richard Atkinson and California's Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing Agency Maria Contreras-Sweet	Executed memorandum of understanding aligning relevant California state agencies at the UC system in the California Alcohol Issues Partnership into which CSU system had entered a year earlier
March 13 - 16	Center personnel	Communicated with Robert Wood Johnson Foundation AMOD grantees and National Program Office regarding findings relevant to California campus-communities
April 1	Center staff	Conducted site visit at San Bernardino
April 9	Center staff	Conducted site visit at Long Beach
April 25	Center staff	Presented on CAIP first round findings at 2 <sup>nd</sup> CSU alcohol policy conference in Sacramento
May	Center staff	Submitted draft of this report to Dennis Clear, Cal ABC; Allison Jones and Colleen Bentley-Adler, CSU Chancellor's Office; Shirley Uplinger, CSU Alcohol Policy Steering Committee and CSUS

## Appendix 6: Pilot Campus Alcohol Policy and Enforcement Snapshots

CSU CAMPUS	RELEVANT WEB SITES
Chico	<p>CSU Chico Alcohol Policy and Programs (June 7, 1999)  <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/sa/alcoholpolicy/">www.csuchico.edu/sa/alcoholpolicy/</a></p> <p>CSU Chico's Alcohol Abuse Prevention Plan  <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/sa/alcoholpolicy/preventionplan.html">www.csuchico.edu/sa/alcoholpolicy/preventionplan.html</a></p> <p>Letter to Students, Parents and Guardians  <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/sa/alcoholpolicy/Letter.html">www.csuchico.edu/sa/alcoholpolicy/Letter.html</a></p> <p>Student Organization Alcohol Policy <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/sac/newalcoholpolicy.html">www.csuchico.edu/sac/newalcoholpolicy.html</a></p> <p>Campus Alcohol and Drug Education Center (CADEC) <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/cadec/">www.csuchico.edu/cadec/</a></p> <p>Chico Safe Rides <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/cadec/saferides.html">www.csuchico.edu/cadec/saferides.html</a></p>
Fresno	<p>CSU Fresno Policy on Campus use of Alcoholic Beverages (July 27, 2000)  <a href="http://studentaffairs.csufresno.edu/programs/alcohol.html">studentaffairs.csufresno.edu/programs/alcohol.html</a></p> <p>New Alcohol Advisory Council named  <a href="http://www.csufresno.edu/univrelations/feature/journal/vol5/1112/alcohol.html">www.csufresno.edu/univrelations/feature/journal/vol5/1112/alcohol.html</a></p>
Hayward	<p>Policy on Alcohol and Other Drugs (October 16, 2002)  <a href="http://wwwsa.csuhayward.edu/PolicyAOD.shtml">wwwsa.csuhayward.edu/PolicyAOD.shtml</a></p>
Long Beach	<p>Alcohol, Drugs and Weapons Policies (April 23, 2003)  <a href="http://daf.csulb.edu/offices/ppfm/police/drug_alcohol.html">daf.csulb.edu/offices/ppfm/police/drug_alcohol.html</a></p> <p>Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs (ATOD) Prevention Program  <a href="http://www.csulb.edu/centers/shc/atod/">www.csulb.edu/centers/shc/atod/</a></p>
Monterey Bay	<p>Policy on Drugs and Alcohol (undated)  <a href="http://police.csumb.edu/police/student_right_to_know/drug%20and%20alcohol%20policy/">police.csumb.edu/police/student_right_to_know/drug%20and%20alcohol%20policy/</a></p>
Sacramento	<p>Alcohol Beverage and Drug Policy (May 6, 2002)  <a href="http://www.csus.edu/admbus/umannual/UMA00550.htm">www.csus.edu/admbus/umannual/UMA00550.htm</a></p> <p>Survey: CSUS students' alcohol drinking below national average  <a href="http://www.statehornet.com/vnews/display.v?TARGET=printable&amp;article_id=3d755b6893b24">www.statehornet.com/vnews/display.v?TARGET=printable&amp;article_id=3d755b6893b24</a> and  <a href="http://www.csus.edu/news/082702alcohol.htm">www.csus.edu/news/082702alcohol.htm</a></p>

San Bernardino	<p>Policy on Alcoholic Beverages on Campus (June 4, 1990)  <a href="http://policies.csusb.edu/alcoholpolicy.htm">policies.csusb.edu/alcoholpolicy.htm</a></p> <p>Note: more recent version may appear in Student Affairs Handbook per  <a href="http://www.csumentor.edu/FAQ/camp_answ16.html">http://www.csumentor.edu/FAQ/camp_answ16.html</a></p>
Sonoma	<p>Alcoholic Beverages (<u>October 25, 1999</u>)  <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/alcoholpolicy.htm">www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/alcoholpolicy.htm</a></p> <p>Housing regulations – alcohol  <a href="http://bookstore.sonoma.edu/housing/housregs.html#alcohol">bookstore.sonoma.edu/housing/housregs.html#alcohol</a></p>

Sources: [www.csumentor.edu/FAQ/camp\\_answ16.html](http://www.csumentor.edu/FAQ/camp_answ16.html) and respective campus Web sites (as indicated)

## Appendix 7: Santa Cruz Alcohol Permit Fee

### Alcohol Sales Permit Fee Instructions

In mid December of each year, The City of Santa Cruz will mail an annual billing statement (invoice) to each retail seller of alcohol in the City. The invoice will detail the amount of the annual Alcohol Sales Permit Fee. Payment is due January 31st. Any requests for category changes (as explained below) are due by January 15th.

On November 24, 1998, the Santa Cruz City Council established an Alcohol Sales Permit Fee to recover approximately one-half of the cost of the Police Department's Alcohol Education, Monitoring and Compliance Program.

The Alcohol Sales Permit Fee is based on the following three components:

1. The risk component is determined by definition under the local alcohol ordinance. Businesses are classified as either low or high risk.
2. The hours component is determined by the latest hour in which a business sold alcohol on any day in the previous year.
3. The volume component refers to the dollar volume of a business' wholesale alcohol purchases for the previous calendar year. In the case of a partial year for new businesses, the volume will be based on annualized purchases.

The individual fee has been calculated based on classification into various categories within the risk, hours, and volume components. The hours and volume components are divided into 3 categories as described in the table below.

Category	Hours Component Actual Hours	Volume Component - Purchases Actual Amounts
Low	No later than 10:00 p.m.	Zero to \$100,000
Medium	No later than midnight.	\$100,001 to \$300,000
High	No later than 2:00 a.m.	Over \$300,000

The fee for each category is:

Alcohol Sales Permit Category Fees			
Category	Risk	Hours	Volume
Low	\$72.68	\$35.61	\$118.09
Medium		\$106.83	\$354.26
High	\$290.73	\$320.48	\$1,062.79

The City has assigned each business a category for hours and volume based on the prior year's fee.

**IMPORTANT:** If, for any reason, a business disagrees with the category classifications assigned by the City, the business must respond, in writing, to the City Finance Department by January 15th. The City may then issue a revised invoice. Payment will still be due January 31st. Send any such request to City of Santa Cruz Finance Department, 809 Center St., Room 8, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.

Questions regarding the fee or the Alcohol Education, Monitoring and Compliance Program, should be directed to Lt. Patty Sapone at (831) 420-5842 at the Police Department. Questions regarding a specific bill should be directed to Deborah Sultan at (831) 420-5075. (e-mail at [dsultan@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us](mailto:dsultan@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us) )

Payment is due by January 31st. Penalties and interest are charged for late payment. If payment is made in February, a 10 percent penalty is assessed. If payment is made after February, a second 10 percent penalty is also charged. In addition to penalties, interest on late payments is charged at the rate of one and one-half percent per month, or fraction thereof.

Source: [www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/fn/alcofee.html](http://www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/fn/alcofee.html)